

✓
G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Ch. 119-19(2+3)

File No. 182-19

1919.
(6 to)

Serial Nos. 1-4

Later references.

Ch. 182-19-5
" 182 9(5,6)

P
GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

219
Serial Nos. 200

Part B for March 1920.

SUBJECT.

Govt. sanction directing the Govt. Advocate to conduct the proceedings on behalf of Govt. in the Chief Court against Mr. K. Ranga Sanyal, Advocate, under the Legal Practitioners' Regulations.

8(4) 7th The District Magistrate, Tumkur.

No. G.C. 386/19-20 Dtd 23rd Feb 20.

Submits the records in the case under question

14755

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Convb)

NOTES.

File No. 182 19

FILE HEADING.

Government sanction ^{directing} the Government Advocate to conduct the proceedings on behalf of Government in the Chief Court against Mr. K. Ranga Iyengar, Advocate, under the Legal Practitioners' Regulation

From

The Deputy Commissioner & Dist Magistrate, Dindur.
No. J.C. 386/19-20 Dated 6th Feb 7/1920 Received on 10.2 1920

Diary No. 4755

Enclos. nil Spare Copies. nil

Serial No. /

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Rep. states that Mr. K. Ranga Iyengar, Advocate, is to be tried by the Chief Court under the Legal Practitioners' Regulation on 23rd instant and requests that Government Advocate may be asked to conduct the proceedings on behalf of Government.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

After Secretary's order on the Paper under disposal.
"Immediate". What are the facts and what is the nature of the charge? (M.D.) P.M. 10¹²
Submitted, no information is available in the Branch;
and there is not enough time to get information from the D. Magistrate.
Draft is however subd.

NOTES—First Sheet.

Subd for orders
No date of A-1 is 23-2-1920

Chief Secy
II Member

13/2

14755

Serial
No.

3) The Govt Advocate may be asked to
conduct the case:

2nd member
O.

CSX
14/2/20

4) The Govt Advocate

may be asked to appear
in the court - i.e. the
District Magistrate may be
asked to send a report about
the case.

14/2

14/2

R² 16/2

5) The Govt Advocate may be asked to
conduct the case as per the order
of the District Magistrate.

16/2

CS
15/2
5 PM

6) Submitted with a draft S.O. as per order above

19/2

7) Memo issued today

19/2

20

The Govt. Advocate & the D. M. Trunkur.

No. G. 19273-4 dt 21st February 1920.

Directs the Govt. Advocate to conduct

the case against Mr. K. Ranga Svarup, & to appear
in the Chief Court on behalf of Govt.

5) This ought to have been
issued on 19/2/20. If there was
any difficulty, I shd. have
been inf^d of it. There can be
no excuse for an
of this kind & it shd be
explained: D. M.
20/2

with
plea: explain
separately
19/2

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

14755
15305
15633 (5)
CS File No. 182 of 1919.

Serial
No.

3

To the District Magistrate, Tumkur.

No. G. 19275 of 21st February 1920.

Requests ^{him} to furnish necessary information
as to the facts of the case.

Submitted with a draft as per oral instructions

RL
21/2/1920

(b) These items to-day

10.14.
21/2

Issued No. G. 19363 of 21-2-20.

4

From,

The District Magistrate, Tumkur Dist.

J.C. No. 884/1920 of 23-2-1920 recd on 25.2.1920

Submit the records in the case under scrutiny.

Submitted with reference to para 4 above.

RL
25/2/1920

By subd for para 4b.

It seems to be doubtful whether it is so far case to be proceeded against under the Regal Prach & Regl.

The Govt. has obtained an adjt to study the case.

10.14.
21/3

Mr. A. also expressed the same opinion.
10.14.

4626
3.3.20

III Member

11/2

5/3 10.14.
5/3

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

1373 9-MAR 1920

Office of the District Magistrate,

Tumkur District,

Dated Tumkur, the 6th February 1920.

From

M. Lakshman Sastri, Esquire, B.A.,

Assistant Commissioner, for

Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate,

Absent from the station on leave, Tumkur.

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e .

Sir,

I have the honour to state, that on a report made by this Court about the conduct of Mr. K. Ranga Iyengar, Advocate, under the Legal Practitioner's Regulation, the Chief Court has posted the case for hearing on Monday the 23rd day of February 1920, and to request that the Government Advocate may kindly be asked to conduct the Proceedings in the Chief Court on behalf of Government, in the Miscellaneous Case, against Mr. K.-Rangiengar.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Lakshman Sastri

Assistant Commissioner, for
District Magistrate,

Tumkur District, absent from
the station on leave.

D.N.

[Handwritten notes:]

Wm. J. ...

... fast ...

P. M.

1072

197-

27m/3
I
G.R.S. VI-71]

SUBJECT

Which that the Government Advocate
will conduct the case in the Chief Court

Diary No. of letter replied to

14755

Section C1

File No. 102 -

Serial No. 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

the

191

Date of issue

21/2

Signed by

M. P. M.

Read—

Letter no. J.C. 386/19.20 dated
6th Feb. 1920 from the District Magistrate
Dunkin^{Dr} requesting ^{that} ~~to direct~~ the Govern-
ment Advocate ^{maybe directed} to conduct the case
against Mr. K. Rangaiengar, Advocate
in the Chief Court ^{under the Legal Practitioners Regulation} on behalf of
Government.

May this be

- i Printed ?
- ii treated as a standing order ?
- iii published in the Gazette,
English Part ?
- iv translated ?
- v placed at the disposal of the press ?
- vi published in the Gazette,
Kannada Part ?

Order Thereon No.

192734

are pleased to request
Government ^{to direct} that
the Government Advocate ^{to} conduct
the case above referred to, in the
Chief Court, on behalf of Government.

P. M.

19/2

For Chief

To The Government Advocate
District Magistrate, Dundigudi

21/2

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section *cls*

File No. 182-19

Serial No. **3**

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

the

191

No.

59275

Date of issue.....

24/2

To

Signed by.....

M. P. M. Sir

The D. Magistrate, Trunkur DT

*State that the Govt Advocate
has been authorized to
appear on behalf of the
Govt & to request*

With reference to your letter
no. JC 386/19-20 of 6.2.20 requesting
that the Govt Advocate may be asked to
conduct the Prop in the chf cant
on behalf of the Govt in the case against
Mr K Rangaswami under the Legal
Practis Act. I am directed to
request you to be so good as to furnish
information, immediately, as to the
facts of the case & the nature
of the charge.

over.

24/2

13/4/20

Amundam
Can't see
187
24/2/20
He has been sent to I think.
Mano kalyan
24/2/20
15345
D.O. J.C. 386

Office of the District Magistrate.

Tumkur District.

Dated, Tumkur, the 20th February 1920

Dear Sir,

In inviting kind reference to my letter No. J.C. 386/19-20 dated the 6th February 1920, I am to state that the case against Mr. K. Rangienagar, Advocate, under the Legal Practitioner's Regulation is posted for hearing, in the Chief Court, to the 23rd inst. As requested by me already, the Government Advocate may kindly be asked to conduct the Proceedings, in the case, on behalf of Government.

Yours sincerely,

Anandaram

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.

Chief Secretary to the Government of

H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Bangalore.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Ch.

File No. 182-59

Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

the

191

D.O.

No.

89365

Date of issue.....

21/2

To

Dear Sir,

Signed by.....

M. P. M.

With reference to your

D.O. no. J.C. 386 of the 20th Feb 1920
re: the case against Mr. K. Ranga
Iyengar, Advocate, under the Legal
Practitioners' Regulation, I am
~~desire~~ ^{directed} to invite your attention to
G.O. no. G. 19273-4 / Ch 182-59-2
of 21-2-1920 ^{requesting} directing the Govern-
ment Advocate to conduct the
Case as ^{desired} requested by you.

Yours sincerely

D. M.

over.

Ananda Rao, Sini by B.A. M.
Dist. Magr, Dindur

Office of the District Magistrate,
Tumkur District,

Dated Tumkur, the 23rd February 1920.

From

Ananda Rao Sirsi, Esq., B.A., LL.B.,
District Magistrate, Tumkur District.

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. G.19275/Cts.182-19-3
dated 21st February 1920, requesting to be furnished with
information as to the facts of the case and the nature of the
charge against Mr. K. Rangiengar, Advocate, I have the honour
to forward herewith a copy of the notice issued against Mr.
K. Rangiengar together with a copy of Report made to the
Chief Court in the matter, which furnishes full information.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Ananda Rao Sirsi

District Magistrate,
Tumkur District.

D.N.

Hes

156 33.

13 25

Ct.

182.

4

69

1919-20.

From

The District Magistrate,

Tumkur District, T u m k u r.

To

22332

The Chief Secretary to the Govt.

of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

Dated 23rd February 1920.

Despatched 23rd Feb 1920

Received .

General No. 2 - C - 386 / 12-20
No.

Enclosure No. (Two)

Re certain information required
in the case against Mr. K. Rangienjar,
Advocate, Tumkur.

In the Court of the District Magistrate

Tumkur District.

Dated Tumkur, the 26th September 1919.

N O T I C E.

Whereas an article has been published in the Karnataka of the 27th August 1919, above the signature of "K. Rangienar B.A., LL.B., Tumkur, alleging that the Amildar Magistrate of Kunigal "instead of dealing out justice seems to treat the -- lawyers in a manner derogatory to their calling as members of the noblest profession" and also alleging that "the strange gentleman" meaning thereby the Amildar Magistrate of Kunigal is saying that the District Magistrate" is in his pockets" and also alleging that "Every application was dismissed by the District Magistrate to save the prestige of this strange Magistrate" and that "A public servant who deliberately insults the public instead of doing service to the public has no prestige to be saved and there is our District Magistrate to trying to save the his prestige;" thereby insinuating and implying that the transfer cases have not been decided by the District Magistrate according to his light and conscience and -- making aspersions, imputations and insinuations couched in objectionable language in cases where there is an appeal or other other remedy to the Chief Court and whereas these imputations and aspersions could not have been done with any other object than to attribute motives to both the Magistrates concerned and to attempt to bring the Criminal Administration of the District and the Office of the District Magistrate into contempt or ridicule and whereas from the above, I am satisfied that this conduct on the part, especially of a legal practitioner, who is in a way an Officer of the Court, amounts in publishing such observation in public print to misconduct coming as it does under clause 'b' or 'f' or both of Section

13 B of the Legal Practitioner's Regulation, I Ananda Rao, S. Sirsi, Esq., B.A., LL.B., District Magistrate, Tumkur call upon you Mr. K. Rangiengar, B.A., LL. B., Advocate, Tumkur to appear before the District Magistrate of Tumkur on the 30th October 1919 at 2 P.M. to show cause why you should not be proceeded against under the said Regulation and reported to the Chief Court for being suspended or dismissed from practice.

Sd/ Ananda Rao S. Sirsi

District Magistrate,

Tumkur District.

'Copy'

Ananda Rao S. Sirsi

23/12/20 District Magistrate

19-20.

From

Anaḍḍaḍḍo S. Sirsi, Esquire,
B.A., LL.B.,

District Magistrate,

Punkur District.

To

G. Srinivasa Iyer, Esquire,
B.A., LL.B.,

Registrar, Chief Court of

Mysore, B. A. S. G. A. L. C. A.

Dated

No.

Enc.

Forwarding records of en-
quiry held under the Local Pro-
cutioners Regulation.

Re.

Office of the District Magistrate,
Tumkur District.

From

Amenda Rao Sir 1, Mysore, B.A., LL.B.,

District Magistrate, Tumkur District.

To

S. Prinivas Iyer, Esquire, B.A., LL.B.

Magistrate, Chief Court of Mysore, Mysore.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith records of an inquiry held under
the Local Practitioners Regulation, I have the honour to
state as follows :-

The contents of an article published in Article
1. the correspondence column in its issue of the 7th. July
under the heading of "Mysore Notes" and over the initials
"M.N.". The article contained serious allegations against
the District Magistrate of Mysore and referred to the
District Magistrate's office in consideration to the
contents of the article. This was followed by applications
for the removal of certain original cases from the files
of the District Magistrate. Again, another article was pub-
lished on 14th. July 1914 referring to the contents of the
article and under the heading "Mysore Notes" and over the initials

14

same initials. The transfer applications were duly heard by this Court and they were all dismissed on a careful consideration of all the records and the applications and affidavits filed in the various cases. In two such cases, applications for transfer were preferred to the Honourable the Chief Court, and one was dismissed and the other was not pressed by the petitioner's Advocate. After transfer applications before this Court were duly disposed off, Mr. ...

... published an article in the Varnataka of the 27th August 1912 under the heading 'Prestige in Azcolia' above the signature of M. Vanga Iyengar, B.A. LL.B., Esq. Mr. ... alleging that this Court dismissed the transfer applications to save the prestige of the Milder Magistrate, and impliedly conveying the idea that this Court had not decided the transfer applications properly and was guided solely to save the prestige of the Milder Magistrate.

Although this Court was keenly watching the action of the Milder Magistrate and scrutinised with more than ordinary care the proceedings of the Milder Magistrates in the various cases connected with and was ever watchful of the interests of the ... and reported about it to the Government who called ... Mr. Vanga Iyengar did not seem to be satisfied with this report but still the conclusion of this ...

in deciding the transfer applications, making the following allegations.

"But unfortunately our District Magistrate is trying to save the prestige of his subordinate rather than the prestige of the public"

"Every application was dismissed by the District Magistrate to save the prestige of this strange Magistrate"

"A public servant who deliberately insults the public instead of being service to the public has no prestige to be saved. And there is our District Magistrate trying to save his prestige."

This imputation of bad faith and a charge of grave dereliction of duty was too much and as it was likely to bring into contempt and ridicule the administration of justice by this Court, this Court was therefore compelled to treat this article seriously just to vindicate its honour and prestige, however much it was reluctant to be drawn to the bar. This Court most respectfully begs to state that it has no other motive than to create and induce confidence in the litigant public and to work honestly and fearlessly to the best knowledge and light it possesses. It therefore respectfully begs to state place the whole matter before the Honorable the Chief Court and looks for its per-

protection against what it believes utterly unfounded and malicious imputations levelled against it.

In order to do place the matter before the Honourable the Chief Court, a charge was framed under Section 14 of the Legal Practitioners Act and a copy of it with a notice to appear was served on Mr. Ranga Iyengar. The Public Prosecutor of the Bangalore Division was requested to appear in support of the charge.

Mr. Ranga Iyengar was represented by Mr. H. Venkataswamy of the Local Bar and filed a statement urging that this Court has no jurisdiction to take cognizance of the matter under the Regulation, that the article was published by him only as a citizen and not as an advocate, that it was a fair comment made in the public interest.

I may add that before I suing a notice to Mr. Ranga Iyengar, he was given a chance of expressing his regret and tendering an apology. He questioned my capacity and subsequent to my issuing the notice published another article in the *Prattina* on the 15th. October 1919 -D, attributing motives to me again. This impressed upon me that he was determined to stand and plead justification. The Court called upon the Advocate who appeared for Mr. Ranga Iyengar to state before the previous article referred to above over the 11-

initials "A.R." were not written by Mr. A. Rangayyengar and he declined to give any evidence in answer and added on the closing day of the proceedings that he cannot say whether "A.R." meant Mr. Rangayyengar or not. He also declined to argue in support of his statement and with contempt alleged that he feared he would be hauled up for contempt proceedings in case he argued the case in which he would be compelled to use strong language.

It was a delicate matter to this Court to deal with such action in this case and it has patiently borne the treatment reserved to it and feels it, its duty to place it before the honourable the Chief Court.

Though this court thinks it best to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the honourable the Chief Court, still sections 14 and 15 require that a finding must be given by this Court, I proceed to submit my humble findings as follows:-

(1). I find that this Court has jurisdiction to try proceedings under section 14 read with 15 of the Local Authorities Regulation.

(2). The article was written not by a gentleman who is loved by a number of the public but who was in position of a public, in oficer of the Court of considerable re-

respectability and influence. He cannot be considered to be separate from these two capacities at any time. The true test for deciding this lies in the intrinsic evidence of the articles themselves. The very first article clearly shows that the criticisms arose out of Advocate Mr. Ranga Iyengar not being properly treated by the Milder Magistrate. When the Advocate rushes into print, it is his duty to realize his responsibility and duties, and not make reckless allegations imputing unfounded motives. I am therefore satisfied that the articles were written by him as a legal practitioner, complaining of the bad treatment accorded to him as Advocate.

(3). I am also satisfied that the allegations are by no means fair and not at all written in the interests of the public. These articles arose out of an incident in which Mr. Ranga Iyengar thinks, attention and consideration due to his status and dignity were not given and consequently arose out of a personal matter. The subsequent articles carry the same theme further and the intention that is to be inferred from the various articles in question is nothing but a desire to malign the Milder Magistrate and attack everybody who supported him rightly or wrongly.

(4). I am also satisfied that the articles published over the initials "R.I." cannot but be those of Mr.

Mr. Ranga Iyengar, as they are so connected with one another and the article of August distinctly refers to such articles.

It only remains for me all that the Advocate for Mr. Ranga Iyengar requested this Court to forward the records connected with the transfer applications to the Honourable the Chief Court but I thought they may not be necessary but I will forward them in case the honourable the Chief Court requires them.

I beg respectfully submit the entire records with the necessary references as required by the Regulation for such action as the honourable the Chief Court deems fit to take.

I have the honour to be,

S I R,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- Ananda Rao - S. Sirci
District Magistrate,
Tumkur District.

'Copy'
Ananda Rao
District Magistrate
23/1/20